

**R E M A R K S**

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art references.

Claims 1, 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Hayashi (USP No. 6,359,235) and in view of Jones (USP No. 5,227,583). Applicants note with appreciation that during a telephone interview on May 9, 2006 discussing the patentability of the pending claims, the Examiner agreed that the rejections set forth in the March 7, 2006 Office Action were not valid and that the prior art of record does not teach the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner admitted that the specification of the present invention discloses that the APA teaches that the auxiliary lead is in electrical contact with the signal transmitting lead. As claim 1 of the present invention recites that "the auxiliary lead is *not* in electrical contact with the signal transmitting lead", Applicants assert that the APA does not teach or suggest the above cited limitation of claim 1.

Accordingly, as the cited prior art fails to disclose each and every element of the present invention, the Examiner stated during the interview that the § 103(a) rejections set forth in the above cited Office Action will be withdrawn upon submission of a proper response to the Office Action, which is submitted herein.

Furthermore, even if the specification were incorrect with regard to the APA disclosed in Fig. 7, the § 103 rejection would still be invalid. In the Jones reference, the auxiliary lead 26 is in electrical contact with the signal transmitting lead 36 via electrically conductive bonding pads 18 and bonding wires 40. If the APA teaches that the auxiliary lead is not in electrical contact with the signal transmitting lead, as the Examiner suggests in the Office Action, then the

**Application No.: 10/613,050**

invention disclosed in Jones *cannot* be combined with the invention disclosed in the APA because the auxiliary lead cannot be electrically connected and electrically insulated from the signal transmitting lead *simultaneously*. Thus, the prior art references cannot be combined as the proposed combination of each would render the other inoperative. Accordingly, either the proposed combination of cited prior art references is improper, or the proposed combination of references fails to teach or suggest the present invention. As such, the Applicants respectfully request that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty  
Registration No. 36,139

Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF/NDM:kap  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
Date: June 7, 2006